

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho (US 6,307,530) in view of Suenaga (US 4,772,100).

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho in view of Suenaga and Asada et al. (US 5,963,287).

Claims 1, 10 and 15 are apparently objected to due to some perceived informalities.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended during the personal interview on May 23, 2006.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended the Title of the Invention, and amended claim 15, 17, and 18 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-15 and 17-18 are pending for reconsideration.

Applicant provides a Summary of the Interview, as required under MPEP 713.04.

**Summary of the Interview**

During the personal interview on May 23, 2006, the Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed the differences between the claimed invention and the applied prior art. Specifically, discussions were directed toward the patentably distinct features recited by at least independent claims 1 and 15. As a result of the interview, Applicant hereby amends the Title of the Invention and independent claim 15, in accordance with the Examiner's comments presented during the interview.

### **Claims Objections**

Claims 1, 10 and 15 are objected to due to some informalities. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that use of the term “removable” by claims 1, 10, and 15 is somehow objectionable. However, the Final Office Action again fails to provide any grounds with which to object to the claims. While the original analysis and additional remarks provided by the Examiner are appreciated, Applicant respectfully asserts there is (are) no ground(s) presented by the analysis that would require any amendment to the term “removable.” The Examiner’s distinction of removable “by a user” or “by a technician” is not relevant to the claim, since no matter who removes the control printed circuit board, the board is removable.

Furthermore, the Office Action indicates that “[a]ppropriate correction is required.” However, Applicant is at a loss, without any specific grounds with which to object to use of the term “removable,” as how to make an “appropriate correction.” Accordingly, unless the Examiner can provide specific reasoning or logical argument as to why use of the term “removable” in claims 1, 10, and 15 is objectionable, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office Action withdraw the objection, or issue a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, in order to resolve the exact grounds by which use of the term “removable” is ambiguous or indefinite.

### **All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho (US 6,307,530) in view of Suenaga (US 4,772,100), and claims 9 and 10 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho in view of Suenaga and Asada et al. (US 5,963,287). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon

references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited by independent claims 1 and 15, and hence dependent claims 3-14, 17, and 18.

Independent claim 1, as previously presented, recites a liquid crystal display module including, in part, a first frame, a liquid crystal panel, and a control printed circuit board wherein “the control printed circuit board and the liquid crystal panel are disposed on opposite sides of the first frame.” Similarly, independent claim 15, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display module including, in part, “first and second frames coupled together with the upper and lower substrates and backlight disposed between the front and rear frames,” wherein “the control printed circuit board and the upper and lower substrates are disposed on opposite sides of the first frame.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention and allegations set forth by the Office Action, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho explicitly requires, as shown in FIGs. 1-4, the PCBs 11-13 to be directly mounted onto the rear case 2. Moreover, Suenaga explicitly requires, as shown in FIG. 1, that the circuit boards 3A-C are directly mounted behind the liquid crystal display panel 2, without any frame member disposed therebetween. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho and Suenaga, whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest a first frame, a liquid crystal panel, and a control printed circuit board wherein “the control printed circuit board and the liquid crystal panel are disposed on opposite sides of the first frame,” as required by previously presented independent claim 1. Similarly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho and Suenaga, whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display module including, in part, “first and second frames coupled together with the upper and lower substrates and backlight disposed between the first and second

frames,” wherein “the control printed circuit board and the upper and lower substrates are disposed on opposite sides of the first frame,” as required by amended independent claim 15.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action does not rely upon Asada et al. to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Cho and Suenaga. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action cannot rely upon Asada et al. to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Cho and/or Suenaga since Asada et al. is completely silent with regard placement of a control printed circuit board and a liquid crystal panel on opposite sides of a first frame, as required by independent claims 1 and 15.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the applied prior art references, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited by independent claims 1 and 15, and hence dependent claims 3-14, 17, and 18.


### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By:   
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: June 8, 2006

**Customer Number: 009629**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
202-739-3000